Application No. 10/601,927

Amendment dated January 27, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 13, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are pending and stand rejected.

Applicant, by way of their undersigned attorney, wishes to thank Examiner Dickson for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted for this application on December 7, 2005. The Amendment filed September 26, 2005, via the RCE filed November 14, 2005, in the subject application was discussed, and in particular, the amendments to the independent claims 1, 13 and 19 presented therein were considered. In the interview, it was agreed that the amendments to claim 19 distinguish the art currently applied against the claims. We also discussed including similar limitations in one of the other independent claims 1 and 13, and such has been included in claim 1 presented herein. Accordingly, it is believed claim 1, and claims 2, 3, 5-12 which depend cognately therefrom, and independent claim 19 and claims 20-22 which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited art.

During the interview, it was also agreed that the art currently applied against the claims fail to show a direction control member having connections to the airbag as recited in amended claim 13. In particular, it was agreed that having connections between the control member and airbag that include one at a rear portion of the airbag adjacent to the rider and a front portion of the airbag that is spaced forwardly therefrom and facing away from the rider to restrict airbag size in the controlled direction between the airbag front and rear portions to be substantially less than in the primary inflation direction, as set forth in amended claim 13, distinguishes from the relied upon art. Nagata et al. is cited for their teaching of an internal sheet 19 as corresponding to the direction control member. However, Nagata et al. focus on how the sheet 19 is sewn to reduce wrinkling for improved folding of the airbag. Accordingly, it was agreed that the recited direction control member having connections at corresponding rear and front portions of the airbag to restrict airbag size as recited in amended claim 13 was not disclosed or suggested by Nagata et al.

Application No. 10/601,927 Amendment dated January 27, 2006 Reply to Office Action of October 13, 2005

Accordingly, it is believed claim 13, and claims 15-18 and 23 which depend cognately therefrom, are allowable over the cited art.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the pending claims 1-3 and 5-23 are now in condition for allowance and such action as consistent therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

Stephen S. Favakeh

Registration No. 36,798

Dated: January 27, 2006

120 South LaSalle Street Suite 1600 Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406 Telephone 312.577.7000 Facsimile 312.577.7007